

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

CHARLES L. BOBO, )  
Plaintiff, ) CASE NO. C13-1179-JCC  
v. )  
PLYMOUTH HOUSING GROUP ) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
HUMPHREY HOUSE, )  
Defendant. )

Plaintiff Charles L. Bobo, proceeding *pro se*, submitted an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) and a proposed complaint to this Court for review. (Dkt. 1.) Plaintiff brings his claims against Plymouth Housing Group Humphrey House, and appears to challenge his potential eviction from his housing. (Dkt. 1-1 at 2.) He states his claim as follows: “Visitor come to your room 6 times – no excessive foot traffic allowed short period of time specifically between the hours of 5 AM and 7 AM visitor come to your room 6 time.” (*Id.*)

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), the district court must dismiss a case “at any time” it

01 determines a complaint is frivolous or fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. §  
02 1915(e)(2)(B). Section 1915(e) applies to all IFP proceedings, not just those filed by  
03 prisoners. *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127 (9th Cir. 2000).

04 A review of the Court's filing system reveals that plaintiff has filed over thirty different  
05 actions in this Court. The Court dismissed a number of those cases – including at least two  
06 cases raising similar claims against the same defendant named here – upon finding that plaintiff  
07 failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, that the filing was frivolous, that the  
08 Court lacked jurisdiction, and/or for failure to prosecute. *See, e.g., Bobo v. Plymouth*  
09 *Housing Group Humphrey House*, C13-0849-JCC (Dkts. 2 & 4); *Bobo v. Tracfone Wireless,*  
10 *Inc.*, C13-0071-MJP (Dkts. 3-5); *Bobo v. Plymouth Housing Group Humphrey House,*  
11 C12-2071-MJP (Dkt. 10); *Bobo v. DSHS*, C12-1992-RAJ (Dkt. 6); *Bobo v. Tulane County*  
12 *District Attorney*, C12-1805-RSL (Dkts. 3-5).

13 As in those prior cases, plaintiff here fails to set forth facts sufficient to state a  
14 cognizable claim against the defendant, fails to set forth any basis for jurisdiction in this Court,  
15 and submits a complaint that appears frivolous on its face. Accordingly, the Court  
16 recommends that plaintiff's IFP application be STRICKEN and this matter DISMISSED with  
17 prejudice. A proposed Order accompanies this Report and Recommendation.

18 DATED this 15th day of July, 2013.

19 /s/ MARY ALICE THEILER  
20 Mary Alice Theiler  
21 United States Magistrate Judge  
22